REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed April 17, 2007, the Examiner took the following action: (1) objected to the drawings; (2) rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 11, 12, 25, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schwertfeger et al (U.S. 5,574,260); and (3) rejected claims 3 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwertfeger et al in view of Itakura (D487,137). The Examiner acknowledged, however, that claims 15-18 and 22-24 are allowable, and that claims 4, 8, 13, 14, 28, 30, and 31 would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of their respective base and intermediate claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to include reference characters not mentioned in the description. Applicants have amended Figure 4 to correct the issues noted by the Examiner. Applicants have also amended the specification to reflect the corrections made to Figure 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

II. Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to the claims due to informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 14, 25, and 30 to correct the antecedent basis issues noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Without additional comment and without prejudice as to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants have amended claims and canceled claims in order to expedite the issuance of the subject matter acknowledged as being allowable, and without prejudice to the filing of subsequent divisional or continuation applications to pursue allowance of one or more of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4, placing claim 1 in condition for allowance. Claim 4 has been canceled. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and 11-13 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 11-13 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 1, 5, and 7 which are allowable based on the above comment. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 25 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 28, placing claim 25 in condition for allowance. Claim 28 has been canceled. Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 25. Accordingly, claims 25-27 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 30 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 25 which is allowable based on the above comment. Claim 31 depends from claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30-31 are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 11-18, 22-27, and 29-31 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 30, 2007 By: Dale C. Barr

Dale C. Barr
Reg. No. 40,498
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (206) 315-7916
Fax: (206) 315-4004

Enclosures: Replacement Formal Drawings